UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,201	08/22/2006	Jacques Thomasset	2590-163	5564
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 10/28/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	LOOR	AUGHENBAUGH, WALTER	
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1794		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/590,201	THOMASSET, JACQUES	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

	WALTER B. AUGHENBAUGH	1794					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 13 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of e appeal. Since a				
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further core (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beta properal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the cont	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially rec corresponding number of finally reje	E below); lucing or simplifying tl					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 4.   The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
Claim(s) objected to: <u>5 and 6</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu	t before or on the date of filing a No	stice of Anneal will not	he entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	•	condition for allowan	ce because:				
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Rena L. Dye/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendments to each of claims 1,5 and 6, and new claims 14-18, each present new issues that require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant states that claim 13 addresses the objection to claim 5 and 6 (claim 5 was amended to depend on claim 13), but Applicant has not explained how these amendments overcome the objection, and it is not clear how these amendments overcome the objection. This is at least in part because it is not clear what "...which is imprisoned in the first layer except for , of surface area..." (lines 5-6 of newly presented claim 13) is intended to recite. Clarification and/or correction is requested.

Applicant appears to argue that Nishimura does not teach a thermoplastic resin layer. However, polyester is a thermoplastic resin, so each fiber of polyester woven fabric is a thermoplastic resin layer. Applicant does not acknowlege in the after-final arguments that the fabric is a polyester fabric. Applicant states "[r]esin is not a woven fabric sheet". While a sample of resin may not be a woven fabric sheet, each fiber of polyester fabric is a thermoplastic resin layer, so each fiber of the polyester woven fabric of Nishimura corresponds to the claimed second resin layer. See the text of the 35 USC 102 rejection of record.